



COPY OF PATENTS  
ORIGINALLY FILED

PATENT APPLICATION

042390.P12397

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of:

Eleanor P. Rabadam

Serial No.: 10/039,454

Filed: December 28, 2001

August 21, 2002

Group Art Unit: 2818

Examiner: T. Nguyen

RECEIVED  
SEP - 5 2002  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

For: **PACKAGE FOR A NON-VOLATILE MEMORY DEVICE INCLUDING INTEGRATED PASSIVE DEVICES AND METHOD FOR MAKING THE SAME**

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THIS CORRESPONDENCE IS BEING DEPOSITED  
WITH THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE AS FIRST CLASS MAIL IN AN  
ENVELOPE ADDRESSED TO:  
DIRECTOR OF THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE,  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20231, ON: 8.22.02  
Date of Deposit

INTEL CORPORATION

Name of Assignee

[Signature]  
SIGNATURE

8.22.02  
DATE

RESPONSE

HONORABLE DIRECTOR OF THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE,  
Washington, D.C. 20231

Dear Sir:

In response to the Office Action mailed July 30, 2002, please reconsider the above-identified patent application in view of the remarks below. Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the efforts in identifying issues with this application.

Applicants believe the following is a complete response to the issues raised by the Examiner.

**Response to Restriction Requirement**

The Office Action indicate that restriction between Group 1, claims 1-13, and Group II, claims 14-21, was required. Applicants respectfully traverse the requirement for restriction for the following reasons.

Paragraph 2 of the Office Action simply restated form paragraph 8.18 from § 806.05(f) of the MPEP. However, the Office Action did not provide any explanation as to why restriction was required in this particular application. Applicants kindly point to note 2 of form paragraph 8.18 (see §806.05(f)).

In addition, Applicants would like to kindly point the Examiner to the "Guidelines" subheading of §803. In particular, this section states that the Office Action must provide reasons and/or examples to support conclusions to establish the perquisite prima facie showing that is the basis for the restriction requirement.

In the present case, the Office Action has provide no such explanation. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the Office Action has not established a prima facie showing and respectfully traverse the requirement for restriction.

Conclusion


The foregoing is submitted as a full and complete response to the Office Action mailed July 30, 2002. Allowance of claims 1-21 is earnestly solicited.

Should it be determined that an additional fee is due under 37 CFR §51.16 or 1.17, or any excess fee has been received, please charge that fee or credit the amount of overcharge to deposit account #02-2666.

If the Examiner believes that there are any informalities which can be corrected by an Examiner's amendment, a telephone call to the undersigned at (480) 554-9732 is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Eleanor P. Rabadam et al.



Kenneth M. Seddon  
Senior Patent Attorney  
Reg. No. 43,105

Dated: 8-21-02

c/o Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman, LLP  
12400 Wilshire Blvd., Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026  
(503) 264-0967

RECEIVED  
SEP - 5 2002  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2868